(1)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

No. 03 178 AUG 1 - 2003

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

MATTHEW CARPENTER
Petitioner

v.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA;
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF DELAWARE COUNTY

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The Third Circuit Court of Appellee's

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MATTHEW CARPENTER
Pro se
619 N. MONROE STREET
MEDIA, PA 19063
610-565-1331

3 cert

Lawyers and Judges can't understand the case, and write wrong facts not knowing that there have been so many changes that one Court Order changes another. The State of Pennsylvania, and CYS and two schools have not done their job, Even after someone made mistakes, or on purpose, there is not any disciplinary action. Here in Media, laws can be broken if you know the Master or Judge. The mother broke more than fifty (50) Court Orders and has never been disciplined. Judge Osborne was supposed to conclude my case but wouldn't after two (2) attempts, which she ORDERED. The State of Pennsylvania and CYS have made a conspiracy against me to take away my children after CYS found me unfounded more than one year ago, and this case is of such imperative importance to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this court.

Petition For A Writ of Certiorari

1) Will the Supreme Court consider this case?

2) Why won't Judge Osborne from Delaware County Court House finish my case (Carpenter vs. Kliener) #98-13564 that she ORDERED, twice?

3) Did Pennell, CYS or Judge Osborne's attorney tell her stop?

4) What are they getting out of it?

5) If a Judge can't even follow her own ORDER, why should anyone else?

6) Is that why it was so easy for CYS to break Judge Osborne's ORDER?

7) If the State Court can't protect my children and CYS can't can the Supreme Court?

8) Is the State responsible for abuse to Tiffany, which took place on the grounds of State property while I went outside for a break?

9) Can the Supreme Court handle the approximate 20 times that cases have been fixed against me?

10) What is the purpose of Children and Youth Services?

11) Can anyone understand the facts of the case yet?

12) Do you know that after three (3) attempts, District Court, Third Circuit has not gotten the facts right?

13) Why do they state the procedural history of the case is well known?

14) Why does everyone think that judges are absolutely immune?

15) Hasn't any judge in the world ever took a bribe or told to protect one person because they had a friend for a judge?

16) Is there no penalty for a judge in that circumstance?

17) Or does one just say to a judge, don't do that again?

18) Does anyone know that the mother's father was a policeman for about twenty (20) years?

19) Why couldn't the Third Circuit understand that there are more things than they list such as child support with two (2) mothers, money, settlements, E.P.A. criminal acts, insurance fraud, credit card fraud, conspiracy, court cased fixed, court Orders broken?

20) Does Hon. Judge DuBois think all of this happened in another state?

21) How could I incorrectly name State of Pennsylvania?

22) Why would Hon. Judge DuBois state that plaintiff has been denied legal custody of, and has been ordered to have no contact with, his children?

23) Doesn't he know about the December 31 ORDER from Judge Osborne?

24) Doesn't he know a CYS worker from another office, that had nothing to do with that matter, came into court on February 1, 2002 and took over the court, and broke the December 31, 2001 Order from Judge Osborne and suggested that I never see my children again, after CYS found me unfounded?

25) Or was someone just protecting CYS?

26) Why does Hon. Judge DuBois still think this is all an oversight?

27) Would anyone care to just compare transcripts with what happened in court?

28) Does anyone see that the mother disobeyed about fifty (50) court ORDERS?

29) Why do Pennell, CYS and the State want to protect her?

30) Why has she not been disciplined for the last four (4) years?

31) Does it matter at this point that all this could have been avoided if CYS did their job in July 1998 when I filed a large complaint?

32) Does the Supreme Court believe in evidence or exhibits?

33) Do you know, as far as I can remember, that in my case Delaware County doesn't believe in evidence?

34) Does it matter to the Supreme Court that one Media policeman physically abused a 17-year-old boy and when it went to court, in front of a judge, he got away with it?

35) What did he mean by, "If my wife was in the car, I would have gone to jail"?

36) Do you know that I wanted to tell the mother to call CYS, but I know they would have done nothing?

37) Can the Supreme Court restore the laws in Media?

38) Isn't this enough for such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from appellate practice and to require immediate determination in the Court?

39) Can the Supreme Court, by now, realize that Delaware County Court House has so far departed from the accepted and visual course of judicial proceedings as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power?

40) Does the Supreme Court back up President Bush's new law of Amber Alert?

41) Does this McComb vs. Wambuagh, 934 F.2d 474, 482-83 (3d Cir 1991) case involve CYS making a fabricated story, then disobeying a judge, and using a conspiracy with mother and State and CYS?

42) If the State and CYS can't protect my children, can the Supreme Court?

43) Was the Third Circuit right when they wrote, "Review of such adjudications must be pursued in the State Appellate System, and, if necessary, by way of review of the State's highest court in the United States Supreme Court"?

44) If you had 441 complaints against the State, what would that lead you to believe?

45) Do you know that I have another 147 questions that pertain to this complaint that the State has not answered in my Memorandum dated May 15, 2002?

46) Do you know that here in Pennsylvania, we don't believe in conflict of interest among lawyers?

47) Do you know that we even have settlements given to people that were not even hurt in accidents?

48) Do you know that I was in an accident that I was supposed to get money from but the mother got it instead?

49) Is it okay that I still work after failing a physical?

50) Is it just because I live in Media?

51) Would it be hard to find out why I filed the complaints against the State?

A List of Parties

Matthew Carpenter, Pro se
619 North Monroe Street
Media, PA 19063

David M. Donaldson, Esquire
Administrative Office of PA Courts
1515 Market Street - Suite 1414
Philadelphia, PA - Attorney

Hon. Jan DuBois - August 27, 2002
District Court
Third Circuit: Nygaard, Stapleton, Cowen - April 22, 2002

Judge Osborne, State of Pennsylvania
(Carpenter vs. Kliener) #98-13564
Delaware County Court House, Media, PA
Common Pleas

Table of Contents

Jurisdiction. 1

Statement Under Rule 14. 2

Statement Of The Case. 3

Argument. 6

Conclusion. 8

Appendix A. . . . . App. 1

Appendix B. . . . . App. 4

Appendix C. . . . . App. 6

Appendix D. . . . . App. 8

Appendix E. . . . . App. 12

Appendix F. . . . . App. 14

Appendix G. . . . . App. 16

Appendix H. . . . . App. 18

Jurisdiction

Third Circuit's opinion is: Review of such adjudications must be pursed in the State Appellate system, and, if necessary, by way of review of the State's highest court in the United States Supreme Court In re Diet Drugs 282 F.3d (220, 240 3r) (Cir) 2002.

This court has jurisdiction under 28 USC – 2101E, in that claims are under the laws of the United States. There is such an imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this Court.

The reasons set forth: Media, PA departed from the law. This land is lawless. Judges, cops, lawyers have made Media lawless and they don't protect children, even disabled children. A Judge makes an ORDER. CYS or mother or even that same Judge can't even follow it, with a conspiracy tagged along with it. They have so far departed from most all law and from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, to call for an exercise of this court's supervisory power.

Statement Under Rule 14

A mother of my children, Judges, lawyers, a Media cop and Children and Youth Services, have disregarded the law. They can't enforce the law, stick by the law, or even follow a Court ORDER. CYS, a Master and a mother even have caused a conspiracy against me, and CYS disobeyed a Judge's Order even to go as far as when CYS found me "unfounded" in a case when the mother accused me of hurting my daughter, they still will not let me see my daughters again. Then the same Media cop physically abused a 17 year old right in front of me, and when it went to Court the Judge protected the cop. I would have told the mother to contact CYS but they will do nothing anyway. This should certainly call for such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice to require immediate determination in this Court. Media is lawless.

Statement Of The Case

This case started with the mother's boyfriend "Bill" beating up my daughter badly, Tiffany has disabilities. Then I filed a big complaint with CYS, which didn't give me any help. Then the mother of my children kidnapped my children, which led me to file for custody. The mother never got disciplined for this action. Then followed up with a tip from a Federal cop giving me a tip where the mother fled to because of some sort of underage drinking party. From the FBI tip, I found my children, then the mother charged me with stalking, harassment. I then found out that the mother's friend "Bill" beat Tiffany up badly. That is when I filed a big complaint to Children and Youth Services, who rarely did much. From then on, the mother's boyfriends have been beating up my children and CYS will do nothing. I have made over 50 complaints to CYS and they still will do nothing to help. Even a psychologist agrees (Larry More). Next came court appearances with everyone fixed against me along with a conspiracy. CYS found out that the courts protect CYS and CYS protects the courts.

January 10, 2001, I went to Pennell Elementary to see if I could get my daughter re-evaluated. They said "no".

January 29, 2001 the mother and her lawyer did not show up for court. The next court-date was March 7, 2001. The Master and the mother cause a conspiracy against me or it was fixed that I lose legal custody and very bad things were written about me. Two things happened to make this possible. I went to the school and the mother never showed up for court because at that time she might have lost her kids.

This teaches me that I can have someone ask to re-evaluate Tiffany and not show up for court and I will get the kids. This should be a State court decision. They have decided not to take on this case by someone telling the Judge not to continue this case. After that, the courts and CYS have come to understand that no one can stop them.

On November 19, 2001 the mother (Kathy Kleiner) filed a protection from abuse, stating that I hurt my daughter, Shannon. Which I never did. The mother fabricated a story to CYS. Then CYS didn't make a decision on the one investigation of 30 days. Then they told me to talk to another CYS office and they sent me back to the same office. A run around story.

CYS finally found me "unfounded" on December 20, 2002, which didn't matter because I caught their lies and cover-ups.

On December 31, 2002, I went to the Courthouse and Judge Osborne made an ORDER and that said, "In light of the prohibition therein against any contact between Matthew Carpenter and his minor children pending completion of the Children and Youth Services investigation, and said investigation now appearing complete, the Office of the Court Administer is directed to place this matter before Master Urso as quickly as possible consistent with other previously scheduled matters before the Master."

On February 1, 2002 court was set on this date. The mother and a CYS worker from another CYS office, which had nothing to do with this matter, came into court suggesting to the Master that Matthew Carpenter never to see his children again. CYS caseworker did have their lawyer present.

The Master did not allow my evidence, did not allow me to object, just let CYS take over court like she owned it. CYS, mother, and Master can get away with this since they must know that no judge in Media will care what they do.

After May 15, 2002 court ORDER that Judge Osborne wrote that somehow never happened, I decided to file a complaint against the State of Pennsylvania, in Federal Court, because Judge Osborne did not follow her own ORDER of May 15, 2002. During that time the Judge made another ORDER on October 28, 2002.

Before October 28, 2002 came I filed a large complaint against the State of Pennsylvania. When October 28, 2002 finally came, the attorney for the State of Pennsylvania and Judge Osborne talked about my case of Kleiner vs. Carpenter and State of Pennsylvania (in the transcripts). The Judge said, "Your case was dismissed" meaning they protected one another.

This definitely calls for such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this Court.

Argument

No one understands the case or how it came about. Judges protect one another and CYS. Media is lawless. Judge Osborne makes an Order no one follows it or she can't even follow her own order, twice. Upper Darby, Tiffany's school before Pennell, helps to start these problems, which carry over to Pennell, and once Pennell got Tiffany they haven't done their job. It was in the State's hand to resolve this, but they failed along with CYS who won't do their job either. This has left me to file against Pennell, CYS, and the State of Pennsylvania. Regardless if someone thinks I filed under IDEA, Upper Darby and Pennell failed to do their jobs. I was the only one to recognize that Upper Darby caused these problems first and even Karl agreed with me. The Delaware County Courthouse doesn't want to deal with this, nor CYS, they don't understand or care, plus I have two (2) years left of checking to see if they did their jobs right. It's pretty hard when Pennell gets a new Director of Special Education just about every year for about the last five to seven years. The one they have now came from Upper Darby which started all this.

CYS has not done their job correctly since 1991 and since I made a big complaint in July 1998. They should have been fully responsible since 1998. To break a judge's ORDER and not allow me to see my children for over one and a half years after clearing my name (unfounded) must put CYS above the law. After four (4) years of abuse of my children from their mother and her boyfriends, I guess CYS has been allowed to get away with that and not have to explain all the cover-ups. I hope some day in the future I will be able to show my evidence of the "unfounded" letter to a judge without CYS in the room preventing me from seeing my children plus Judge Osborne's ORDER allowing me to bring up all things that

happen to my children, along with the fabricated story that prevented me from seeing my children. Perhaps someone besides CYS could just ask the children what really happened.

We have no order in Media. No one has yet to supervise the wrong doings of mother, schools, CYS and State. No justice after two (2) schools, four (4) years of hearings, custody, child support, criminal acts, conspiracy, broker Court Orders (50), mental abuse, physical abuse and as of November 30, the State Court doesn't allow witnesses to take the stand, there has been little or no disciplinary action. The State still has and won't answer my 147 questions.

Conclusion

To put law back in 'edia. To supervise our every move or decision that we m.. e. Explain to CYS that they shouldn't disobey a Judge's Order and the mother of my children. To find another agency to protect my children other than CYS.

Matthew Carpenter — Matthew Carpenter

6-11-03 — Date

7-28-03 — Date - 2nd filing

APPENDIX A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MATTHEW CARPENTER,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,	:	NO: 02-6667
Defendant	:	

ORDER

AND NOW this 27th day of August, 2002, upon consideration of the Motion of the Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County, incorrectly named "State of Pennsylvania," to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (Document No. 3, filed August 22, 2002), the allegations set forth in plaintiff's Complaint,[1] and good cause appearing, IT IS ORDERED that the Motion of the Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County, incorrectly named "State of Pennsylvania," to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (Document No. 3, filed August 22, 2002) is GRANTED and plaintiff's Complaint (Document No. 1, filed August 8, 2002) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

The decision of the Court is based on the following:

1. Plaintiff has previously brought two actions in this Court, against Penn Delco School District, incorrectly named

[1] Because the Court is familiar with the background of plaintiff's case, the Court deems it appropriate to issue this Order without receipt of a responsive filing from plaintiff.

Pennell School District, Elementary Unit (Docket No. 01-6270), and against Children & Youth Services (of Delaware County) (Docket No. 02-625). Upon motion of the defendants in both cases, the Court, on August 9, 2002, issued a Memorandum and Order dismissing plaintiff's two Complaints. See Carpenter v. Pennell Sch. Dist. Elem Unit, 2002 WL 1832854 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 9, 2002) [2];

2. The facts underlying plaintiff's allegations in his suits against the Penn Delco School District and Children & Youth Services are more fully set forth in the Court's August 9, 2002, Memorandum. In brief, plaintiff's allegations in those cases concerned the welfare of plaintiff's children, Tiffany and Shannon Carpenter. Pursuant to an order of the Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County, plaintiff has been denied legal custody of, and has been ordered to have no contact with, his children;

3. In the instant case, plaintiff seeks relief against the Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County. He enumerates 441 reasons as to how that court has violated his rights, all of which are related to either the court's oversight of his custody dispute with the mother of his children or the court's purported failure to ensure that proper educational services are provided for his children;

4. Plaintiff seeks the following forms of relief; (i) this Court's assumption of jurisdiction over the custody matter; (ii) a declaratory judgment that defendant has violated "at least 400 of Plaintiff's rights"; (iii) an order directing the "State" to "make CYS grant me my children"; (iv) an award of "S.C.O.R." services to plaintiff's children; (v) placement of this case before a grand jury; (vi) assistance in finding a house

[2] After the Court issued its August 9, 2002, Memorandum and Order, plaintiff submitted to the Court an "Amended Memorandum." The Court treated plaintiffs "Amended Memorandum" as a Motion for Reconsideration and denied that Motion in an Order dated August 23, 2002.

for plaintiff and his children; (vii) "75 make up days" with plaintiff's children; (viii) an award of four vacations with plaintiff's children; and (ix) "Proof of Life of Tiffany and Shannon";

5. Nowhere in the Complaint does plaintiff state claims upon which relief can be granted, because:

(a) This Court may not assume jurisdiction of plaintiff's claims under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine as plaintiff's claims seek reversal of final state-court orders. See District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983); Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923);

(b) This Court may not enforce Pennsylvania law governing child custody mattersagainst state officials, including judges of the Court of Common Pleas. See Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman, 465 U.S, 89 (1984); and

(c) To the extent plaintiff's requested relief may be characterized as compensatory in nature, plaintiff my not seek such relief against judicial officers, who are shielded by absolute immunity. See Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9 (1991);

6. Plaintiff's Complaint in this case is, therefore, dismissed, with prejudice; pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

BY THE COURT:

"s/Jan E. Dubois, J

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NO. 02-3420

MATTHEW CARPENTER,

Appellant

v.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA;
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF DELAWARE COUNTY

On Appeal From the United States District Court For the
Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civ. No.02-cv-06667)
District Judge: Honorable Jan E. DuBois

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1 (a)
APRIL 21, 2003

Before: NYGAARD, STAPLETON AND COWEN, Circuit Judges.

JUDGMENT

This cause came on to be heard on the record from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was submitted pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1 (a). On consideration whereof, it is now here

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by this court that the

judgment of the district court entered August 27, 2002, be and the same is hereby affirmed. Costs taxed against thE appellant. All of the above in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

ATTEST:

"/Marcia M. Waldron
Clerk

DATED: April 22, 2003

Certified as a true copy and issued in lieu of a formal mandate on May 14, 2003

Teste: Marcia M. Waldron

Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

APPENDIX C

In the Court of Common Pleas of DELAWARE
County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION
PO BOX 543, MEDIA, PA. 19063
Phone: (610) 891-4314 Fax: (610) 891-1959
APRIL 25, 2003

MATTHEW D. CARPENTER SR
619 N MONROE ST
MEDIA PA 19063-2505

Plaintiff Name: ELIZABETH A. EISENACHER
Defendant Name: MATTHEW D. CARPENTER SR
Docket Number: 9004183
PACSES Case Number: 039004438
Other State ID Number:
Please note: All correspondence must include the PACSES Case Number.

Pre-Review Notice

Dear MATTHEW D. CARPENTER SR

Federal and State Law require this court to provide you an opportunity to request the review of your support order at least once every three (3) years. Your support order was last reviewed on FEBRUARY 8, 1991.

To request a review, you must file a petition to modify the order. If you need assistance in completing the necessary documents or have questions, please contact

this office. As soon as the petition is filed, you will be provided additional documents that must be completed, and an office conference will be scheduled.

If a petition is filed and our review indicates an adjustment of the current order, you will receive a notice of that determination. A conference/hearing would be scheduled to discuss any possible increase or decrease in the amount of your order. If you have any questions concerning this notice contact the office at (610) 891-4314.

Sincerely,

JILL NEUHAUS

Service Type M

Form OM-506
Worker ID
$3YRR

APPENDIX D

December 6, 1999

Dave Sanderson, Principal
Upper Darby School District, Kindergarten Center

RE: Tiffany Carpenter dob: *10/7/92*

Dear Mr. Sanderson,

At my suggestion, my client Matthew Carpenter gave permission for me to supply you information regarding his daughter (the above student) that may be of use to you. I was struck by the paucity of psycho-social information in the recent IEP reevaluation (10/14/99), as I think this area has a great bearing on the possibility of Tiffany making effective use of the educational accommodations you are making available to her.

My client has informed me that he has been in contact with you on occasion regarding Tiffany (as well as about her sister); and I therefore assume that you are well aware of the extreme divisiveness between her separated parents. This in itself is of significance in its contribution to behavioral and learning difficulties that are observed at school, and even more importantly in the likelihood of outside-school compliance and support for learning.

Disrupted and outright non-compliance with court-ordered visitation, charges of harassment, frequent court appearances, involvement of both parents with CYS Protective services (in the past as well as present), and so on, are all the order of the day with this family and around this student.

Obviously, since I see only the father in this case, I have only his perspective and reports on which to base my provisional conclusions in many areas.

Nevertheless, if even a part of his reports are accurate, there is grave cause for concern and the involvement of CPS (Dori Davis, social worker) is well warranted. My client reports that his daughters come to him unkempt, frequently with urine-soaked or feces smeared underwear, fearful of talking to father about events at mother's home. (He reports that when with him, Tiffany often reacts to being reprimanded or corrected by tears and urinating.) He reports that needed medicines and clothes needed by Tiffany often do not accompany her on visitation. In short, Mr. Carpenter accuses the girls' mother of criminal neglect, mistreatment, and lack of proper care.

As you might imagine, given the extremely adversarial nature of the parental relationship in the current climate of legal caution by service providers of all kinds, Mr. Carpenter has great difficulty taking his children for medical treatment and reviewing their medial history and treatment information. He has experienced what appears to me to be very prejudicial and dismissive attitudes from the court and legal system in his attempt to redress his concerns. Dealing with CYS protective services has also brought innumerable frustrations, no substantive results, and in my own view, few benefits to the children. Similarly, my impression is that in involving Mr. Carpenter in the educational process, you are taking a step that is proper, but potential problematic since it is (likely) against the mother's wishes.

My feeling is that you will not find Mr. Carpenter himself a problem, but he is persistent and is seriously interested in his daughters' education and welfare in general. I have

known Mr. Carpenter for approximately 1½ years. His intent in coming to this agency was to resolve his upset over the breakup of his relationship with the girls' mother; but it has since
proceeded to his learning to deal with his own disrupted life situation as well as his girls' special needs effectively as well as with the severely disrupted situations of visitation, child support, and ultimately, their welfare.

Although Mr. Carpenter's own mental status was an issue brought to the court by the girls' mother, and inadequately assessed in the (as of yet incomplete) custody evaluation, I can professionally assure you that this is a non-issue, though Mr. Carpenter's life is not without its problems (such as extended family conflict, appropriate housing, and some parenting and other life-skill deficits). The latter I know intimately through my contact with him - our work together addresses them directly. While I cannot assess whether the father would be the "better" custodial parent as he claims, since I do not know the mother at all, and I am well aware of difficulties that Mr. Carpenter would have to face if he did have full/substantial custody of the children.

However, I can say with confidence that, from the very beginning, Mr. Carpenter's concern about the children's welfare has been markedly evident, and this has been consistent throughout our contact. In fact, the welfare of the children, and what he can do for them from his weak position, has been the total content of many counseling sessions. Over the year and a half, his concern has proven to be consistent, sincere, and genuine.

I am writing this in an attempt to give you some sense of how to take Mr. Carpenter's contact with you, as well as to provide a certain amount of background information

relevant to the children. It is my guess that you already see a number of the problems I have referred to in their effect on Tiffany's (poorly-controlled) behavior in school, emotional and social immaturity, appearance, self-care habits, her attendance, perhaps physical health issues and so on. While a number of these deficits can be attributed to neurological and organic causes, a number of them, - and additional aspects, such as the severity of some deficits, any less-than-expected-progress with them, the difficulty of developing adequate management of the difficulties and deficits that are present - are directly attributable to the seriously disrupted psycho-social circumstances within which she lives, the attitudes and interpersonal treatment to which she is exposed, and so on. Behavioral management in the school, as well as the understanding of what is occurring and planning for future school participation are dependent to a degree on some understanding of these factors.

Since my client has given me permission to discuss anything he has told me which might benefit the children, if you have any questions (about him, his views of mother, of children's educational needs, his relationship with them, etc.), please do not hesitate to contact me, as I would be glad to provide what might be of use to you in behalf of the children.

Sincerely,

D. Laurence More, M.Ed.
PA licensed psychologist
PRA staff therapist

APPENDIX E

COUNTY OF DELAWARE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

OFFICE OF
CHILDREN & YOUTH SERVICES

December 20, 2001

Matthew Carpenter
619 North Monroe Street
Media, PA 19063

Re: Shannon Carpenter
ChildLine # 23-18963

Dear Mr. Carpenter,

The Child Protective Services investigation conducted by this agency is now complete. A status determination of "Unfounded" has been reached on the report of abuse of the above named child and filed with ChildLine, the Statewide Child Abuse Registry. An Unfounded report means that the allegations were not substantiated as defined by the Child Protective Services Law.

The report of suspected child abuse will be maintained in the pending complaint file at ChildLine for one year after the date the report is received by ChildLine. ChildLine will expunge the report within 120 days of the end of the one-year period. Children and Youth Services also will expunge the report from our agency files because ongoing services will not be provided by the agency.

Your cooperation during the investigation has been greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
"s/ Susan Fuller, BA"
Susan Fuller BA
Intake Caseworker

APPENDIX F

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF DELAWARE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL ACTION - LAW

No. 98-13564

Matthew Carpenter
Vs.
Kathy Kleiner **IN CUSTODY**

ORDER

AND NOW, this 31st day of December, 2001, upon consideration of the Emergency Petition for Special Relief in the Nature of Custody filed on this date by Matthew Carpenter together with the documents attached to that Petition, it is hereby ORDERED AND DECREED that the Office of the Court Administrator shall relist the above-captioned custody action before Master Francis Urso pursuant to the request of that Master contained in Paragraph B of the Temporary Custody Order recommended by Master Urso on November 30th, 2001.

In light of the prohibition therein against any contact between Matthew Carpenter and his minor children pending completion of the Children and Youth
Services investigation, and said investigation now appearing complete, the Office of the Court Administrator is directed to place this matter before Master Urso as quickly as possible consistent with the other previously scheduled matters before the Master.

BY THE COURT:
"s/ Ann Osborne"
ANN OSBORNE, JUDGE

APPENDIX G

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

DELAWARE COUNTY
THIRTY-SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

COURTHOUSE

MEDIA, DELAWARE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

19063

(610) 891-4642
FAX (610) 891-5496

February 27, 2002

Matthew Carpenter
619 N. Monroe Street
Media, PA 19063
REGULAR MAIL
CERTIFIED MAIL
7099 3400 0005 4020 2698

Deborah L. Roffman, Esq.
339 West Baltimore Pike
Media, PA 19063

RE: CARPENTER vs KLEIMER
98-13564

Dear Counsel:

The above matter is now scheduled on my list for Trial on Wednesday, May 15, 2002. **The case** will be called at 10:00 a.m. that **morning.**

The case will be tried to completion, once begun. Witnesses must be available to either testify in person or by deposition. During the course of the trial, please be prepared to present to the Court and tile opposing counsel copies of any cases upon which counsel rely regarding resolution of legal issues.

No **later than** Monday, May 6, 2002, **please submit** a written trial **memorandum including the following:**

1. A brief summary of the claim or defense to be presented and the issues that will be before the court for decision.
2. **A** list of the names and addresses of all witnesses who may be called to testify by the party filing the memorandum.
3. A statement of the legal issues in the case, including any unusual questions of evidence.
4. A list of all exhibits to be introduced at trial.
5. A brief statement of any in limine motions that will be filed. All in limine motions must be served upon the opposing counsel and the Court prior to the date of the trial memorandum required above.
6. Exhibits need not be pre-marked; they will be marked by the Court's clerk during the trial. Please bring sufficient copies of any document, which you intend to introduce into evidence.

In matters involving the determination of martial property, the attention of all counsel and parties acting on their own behalf is directed to the requirements set forth in Pa. R.C.P. No. 1920.33. Courtesy copies of all filings pursuant to this Rule must be delivered to chambers no

later than fourteen (14) days before the scheduled trial date. Attention is similarly directed to the potential sanctions set forth in Pa. R.C.P. No. 4019©.

In other matters, all evaluations, expert reports, names and addresses of witnesses and exhibits shall be exchanged between or among counsel pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, but in no event later than 10 days prior to the date of trial. Failure to comply may result in undisclosed material being excluded from evidence by the Court.

This Court will not grant continuance of trial for failure to comply with the above directive. All counsel and parties are hereby advised that continuances of trial will be granted only in extraordinary circumstances. Counsel are requested to immediately inform chambers if a resolution has been reached in any matter before the Court.

This matter will be tried in a Courtroom to be announced. Please do not hesitate to call my chambers if you have any questions or ff we can help you in any way prior to Trial.

Please note that trial days are limited. Please notify chambers as soon as possible if this case has been settled, so the scheduled days can be devoted to another case.

Very truly yours,

"s/ Ann Osborne"
Ann Osborne, Judge

AO/TV
Enclosure

cc: Court File
Office File

APPENDIX H

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

DELAWARE COUNTY
THIRTY-SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COURTHOUSE
MEDIA, DELAWARE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
19063

(610) 891-4642
FAX (610) 891-5496

August 8, 2002

Matthew Carpenter
619 N. Monroe Street
Media, PA 19063
REGULAR MAIL
CERTIFIED MAIL
7099 3400 0005 4020 2483

Deborah L. Roffman, Esq.
339 West Baltimore Pike
Media, PA 19063

RE: CARPENTER vs KLEIMER
98-13564

Dear Counsel:

The above matter is now scheduled on my list for Trial on Monday, October 28, 2002. **The case** will be called at 10:00 a.m. that **morning.**

The case will be tried to completion, once begun. Witnesses must be available to either testify in person or by deposition. During the course of the trial, please be prepared to present to the Court and tile opposing counsel

copies of any cases upon which counsel rely regarding resolution of legal issues.

No **later than** Monday, October 21, 2002, **please submit** a written trial **memorandum including the following:**

1. A brief summary of the claim or defense to be presented and the issues that will be before the court for decision.
2. A list of the names and addresses of all witnesses who may be called to testify by the party filing the memorandum.
3. A statement of the legal issues in the case, including any unusual questions of evidence.
4. A list of all exhibits to be introduced at trial.
5. A brief statement of any in limine motions that will be filed. All in limine motions must be served upon the opposing counsel and the Court prior to the date of the trial memorandum required above.
6. Exhibits need not be pre-marked; they will be marked by the Court's clerk during the trial. Please bring sufficient copies of any document, which you intend to introduce into evidence.

In matters involving the determination of martial property, the attention of all counsel and parties acting on their own behalf is directed to the requirements set forth in Pa. R.C.P. No. 1920.33. Courtesy copies of all filings pursuant to this Rule must be delivered to chambers no later than fourteen (14) days before the scheduled trial date. Attention is similarly directed to the potential sanctions set forth in Pa. R.C.P. No. 4019©.

In other matters, all evaluations, expert reports, names and addresses of witnesses and exhibits shall be exchanged between or among counsel pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, but in no event later than 10 days prior to the date of trial. Failure to comply may result in undisclosed material being excluded from evidence by the Court.

This Court will not grant continuance of trial for failure to comply with the above directive. All counsel and parties are hereby advised that continuances of trial will be granted only in extraordinary circumstances. Counsel are requested to immediately inform chambers if a resolution has been reached in any matter before the Court.

This matter will be tried in a Courtroom to be announced. Please do not hesitate to call my chambers if you have any questions or ff we can help you in any way prior to Trial.

Please note that trial days are limited. Please notify chambers as soon as possible if this case has been settled, so the scheduled days can be devoted to another case.

Very truly yours,

"s/ Ann Osborne"
Ann Osborne, Judge

AO/TV
Enclosure

cc: Court File
Office File

Opposition Brief Unavailable for Filming at This Time